(a) whether the Chief Justice of India has pointed out that judiciary is facing trust deficit and has blamed the advocates for the situation;

(b) whether the Law Panel has also favoured revamping of the legal procedures;

(c) whether the Ministry has decided that fixing accountability on Judges would be a priority;

(d) whether Government has also taken steps to take corrupt Judges to task;

(e) if so, whether judiciary itself is responsible for the delays, arrears and consequent denial of justice; and

(f) if so, to what extent steps have been taken in this regard?

THE MINISTER OF LAW AND JUSTICE (SHRI M. VEERAPPA MOILY): (a) The Supreme Court has informed that the Chief Justice of India has not made such a statement.

(b) The Law Commission has, from time to time, favoured revamping of the legal procedures.

(c) Accountability in the higher judiciary is, at present, being enforced and maintained through an 'in-house' system of the peers.

(d) In the scheme of the Constitution the Judges of the Supreme Court and the High Courts enjoy security of tenure and can be removed only by following the process as provided under Articles 124 and 217 respectively of the Constitution and after following the procedure prescribed under the Judges (Inquiry) Act, 1968.

(e) The reasons for arrears and delay in disposal of cases can be attributed to a large number of factors and it will not be correct to say that judiciary itself is responsible for it.

(f) The Government is in the process of preparing a road map for judicial reforms in the country.

Electoral Reforms

928. SHRI D. RAJA:
SHRI M. P. ACHUTHAN:
Will the Minister of LAW AND JUSTICE be pleased to state:

(a) whether Government has noticed that the voting percentage has not increased substantially and in many parts of the country which has been very low in the general elections, particularly in the general election to the 15th Lok Sabha;

(b) if so, the details of the voting percentage in the last elections, State-wise;

(c) whether it is a fact that many candidates won securing less than half of the votes polled;

(d) whether comprehensive electoral reforms are very necessary in such a situation, to make our Parliamentary democracy vibrant and meaningful; and

(e) if so, the details thereof and what steps are proposed to be taken in this regard?

THE MINISTER OF LAW AND JUSTICE (SHRI M. VEERAPPA MOILY): (a) and (b) The information, whether voting percentage has increased or not report, is not available. However, the voting percentage for the earlier elections to the Lok Sabha (1952-2004) is given in the Statement-I (*See* below). and the State-wise voting percentage of the 15th Lok Sabha is given in the Statement-II (*See* below).

(c) The statement giving the number of votes polled by each of the winning candidates in the Lok Sabha elections, 2009 and the total votes polled in the constituency is given in the annexure [See Appendix 217 Annexure No.11]

(d) and (e) The Election Commission of India had sent 22 proposals relating to electoral reforms on various issues to the Government of India in July, 2004. All proposals were sent to Department related Parliamentary Standing Committee for examination and report, and meanwhile to address 7 proposals, a Bill, namely, the Representation of the People (Amendment) Bill, 2008 was introduced in Rajya Sabha on the 24th October, 2008 which was referred to Department related Parliamentary Standing Committee on Personnel, Public Grievances, Law & Justice for examination and report. The Hon'ble Committee submitted its 33rd Report-on the 18th February, 2009 in respect of said Bill which is under consideration by the Government.

Statement-I

General Election to Lok Sabha 2009 (State wise Voter Turnout)

State	Total No. of PCs	Total Votes Polled	Total Electors	Poll percentage
1	2	3	4	5
Andhra Pradesh	42	42046920	57897654	72.62
Arunachal Pradesh	2	500642	735799	68.04
Assam	14	12141171	17470161	69.5
Bihar	40	24232597	54491790	44.47
Goa	2	564255	1020794	55.28
Gujarat 26	17472865	364384290	47.89	
Haryana	10	8156553	12087697	67.48
Himachal Pradesh	4	2690290	4606674	58.4
Jammu & Kashmir	6	2607335	6573118	39.67
Karnataka	28	24572713	41526941	59.17
Kerela	20	16034875	21865458	73.33
Madhya Pradesh	29	19484608	38082678	51.16

1	2	3	4	5
Maharashtra	48	36991261	72928907	50.72
Manipur	2	1339399	1735979	77.16
Meghalaya	2	822566	1277739	64. 38
Mizoram	1	325991	629384	51.8
Nagaland	1	1189601	1321878	89.99
Orissa	21	17761984	27194864	65.31
Punjab	13	11829304	16958378	69.75
Rajasthan	25	17931593	37060003	48.39
Sikkim	1	251751	300584	83.75
Tamil Nadu	39	30390968	41642466	72.98
Tripura 2	1758501	2082265	84.45	
Uttar Pradesh	80	55407107	116033151	47.75
West Bengal	42	42730548	52486980	81.41
Chhattisgarh	11	8554843	15472137	55.29
Jharkhand	14	9135818	17875221	51.11
Uttarakhand	5	3140045	5887626	53.33
Andaman & Nicobar Islands	1	170103	265110	64.16
Chandigarh	1	343557	524444	65.51
Dadra & Nagar Haveli	1	110363	154212	71.57
Daman & Diu	1	68024	95382	71.32
NCT of Delhi	7	5753047	11097892	51.84
Lakshadweep	1	39498	45983	85.9
Puducherry	1	607948	762440	79.74

Statement-II

Turnout Lok Sabha Elections - 1952-2004

General Election	Year	Male	Female	Total
1	2	3	4	5
1st	1952	-	-	61.2
2nd	1957	-	-	62.2

1	2	3	4	5
3rd	1962	63.31	46.63	55.42
4th	1967	66.73	55.48	61.33
5th	1971	60.90	49.11	55.29
6th	1977	65.63	54.91	60.49
7th	1980	62.16	51.22	56.92
8th	1984	68.18	58.60	63.56
9th	1989	66.13	57.32	61.95
10th	1991	61.58	51.35	56.93
11th	1996	62.06	53.41	57.94
12th	1998	65.72	57.88	61.97
13th	1999	63.97	55.64	59.99
14th	2004	61.66	53.30	57.65

Rigging of Electronic Voting Machines

929. SHRI D. RAJA:
SHRI M. P. ACHUTHAN:

Will the Minister of LAW AND JUSTICE be pleased to state:

(a) whether Government's attention has been drawan to the complaint made by a major political party in Tamil Nadu that Electronic Voting machines (EVMs) were rigged in the Lok Sabha polls;

(b) whether it is fact that some developed countries have reverted to ballot paper after manipulation of EVMs was detected; and

(c) if so, the details thereof and Government's reaction thereto?

THE MINISTER OF LAW AND JUSTICE (SHRI M. VEERAPPA MOILY): (a) Yes, after declaration of the-results of the Lok Sabha 2009, the leaders of some of the opposition parties (DMDK, PMK etc.) have been alleging that EVMs have been tampered with.

DMDK has filed PIL in Hon'ble High Court of Madras, to ban use of EVMs in future elections.

A complaint letter dated 10th June, 2009 from Sh K. Balu, Advocate, Legal Wing of PMK has been received in the Commission.

(b) The Commission does not have any formal information in this regard.

(c) The Commission s views are:-

(1) The EVMs have not been introduced all of a sudden. These have been tested initially and gradually introduced all over the country.